MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

HELD MAY 15, 16, and 17, 1916.

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1916 was held in its office at 1729 New York avenue, NW., Washington, D. C., on May 15th, 16th, and 17th, 1916. The following members were present:

Charles Moore, Chairman;
Frederick Law Olmsted, Vice Chairman;
Thomas Hastings;
Edwin H. Blashfield;
Peirce Anderson;
Herbert Adams;

also Colonel Wm. W. Harts, U. S. Army, Officer in charge of Public Buildings and Grounds, the Secretary and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m., and proceeded at once to the business before it.

1. The minutes of the preceding meeting in Washington, and those of the committee meeting held in New York City on March 31, 1916, were presented and approved

2. FREER ART GALLERY: Mr. C. D. Walcott, Secretary, and Mr. Richard Rathbun, Assistant Secretary, of the Smithsonian Institution, accompanied by Charles A. Platt of New York City, the architect for the proposed Freer Museum, appeared at ten o'clock with reference to the plans and design for the Freer Museum proposed to be erected in southwest corner of the Smithsonian Park at Twelfth and B Sts., SW.

Mr. Platt explained that the building was to have an exterior of Stony Creek granite, preferring this to marble for the purpose of texture, - that most of the interior would be of limestone, but the interior court itself of Tennessee marble.

Details of grades and planting around the building were discussed, particularly the relation of the building to B Street and Twelfth Street. Mr. Platt stated that he had paid no attention to the possibility of eliminating B Street. The Commission

mentioned that they would like to have a start made in the roads according to the lines of the Mall, and would like to do it in connection with this building. Certain convenient changes towards this end in the roads indicated on his plan in front of the building were pointed out to Mr. Platt, which he said he would consider further. He said that the trees shown on the ground plan were located according to the plan of the Mall.

The plans and design were approved, as well as the location of the building on the site selected by the Smithsonian Institution. See Exhibit A.

An official letter to Mr. Platt as to the grades in the vicinity of his building is shown under Exhibit B.

3. GUARD RAIL FOR MCMILLAN PARK: Lieut. Col. Flagler in charge of the local United States Engineer Office by letter advised the Commission that in prolongation of Michigan Avenue there is a very steep bank with an iron fence at the bottom along the McMillan Reservoir, and though an electric lamp stands on the axis of the Avenue on the bank there is a tendency to accidents in the traffic turning from the Avenue into Reservoir Road. As accidents have occurred, the District Commissioners had suggested to him the advisability of placing a suitable guard fence at this point. Colonel Flagler submitted a design for such a guard rail showing an iron pipe and concrete combination for the opinion of the Commission. After an inspection of the site, later on the Commission made a number of suggestions as to changes which in their opinion would improve that design, such as that the posts be made wider and taller, with a simplified cap, the iron rail being held between the posts instead of extending across the top of the posts. They indicated, however, that ~~they would prefer~~ would perhaps be better a solid concrete wall of appropriate design, following possibly the simple design for such a wall adopted along the Avenida Beira-Mar skirting the bay in Rio de Janeiro, a photograph of which was furnished Colonel Flagler with this report. See Exhibit C.

4. WORKING MODEL OF STATUE OF LINCOLN AND PEDESTAL BY D. C. FRENCH: Mr. Adams reported on behalf of a committee consisting of Mr. Blashfield, Mr. Gilbert and himself, that they had inspected Mr. Daniel Chester French's working model, with pedestal, of the statue of Lincoln for the Lincoln Memorial in this city at the sculptor's studio in New York City, and enthusiastically recommended its approval. The report was accepted and the model approved.

5. ASBURY MEMORIAL: Secretary Daniels of the Navy, Chief Justice Campbell of the United States Court of Claims, Secretary Carroll of the Francis Asbury Memorial Association of the Methodist Church, Dr Watson of Baltimore and Augustus Lukeman, sculptor, of New York City, appeared before the Commission at 12 o'clock with two sketch designs in plaster for a memorial to Francis Asbury, a noted Methodist circuit rider of the early days, for a site tentatively selected by them at Columbia Road and Sixteenth Street. The sculptor had utilized the same equestrian figure of Asbury shown in a scheme informally before the Commission at a preceding meeting, but had modified the architectural features of the composition, such as the exedra, considerably.

The Commission felt that inasmuch as they could not now act officially, the next step for the Asbury Association would be to have a bill introduced in Congress and referred to the proper committee; that such a bill would probably come before the Commission by reference from such committee, and that at that time the matter of design could be gone into further. The Commission also furnished the Committee a suitable draft of a bill for its use. See Exhibit D.

6. ERICSSON MEMORIAL FOR WASHINGTON: The Commission next gave consideration to House Resolution 6050, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for a sum of $100,000 for the erection of a suitable memorial in Washington to John Ericsson, the inventor and constructor of the Monitor, which had been referred for report by Mr. Slayden, Chairman of the House Committee on the Library. The Commission recognized the de-

sirability of commemorating the part played by Ericsson as a naval architect, whose invention turned the scale in a naval engagement of supreme importance to the country and transformed naval architecture, and stated the sum of $100,000 mention in the bill to be adequate for a satisfactory memorial.

Mr. Slayden had stated himself to be in favor of a portrait statue, but the Commission advised that the artist should not be restricted to so limited an expression as a portrait statue but should be given full scope for his imagination in a memorial to this prominent man. See Exhibit E.

Mr. Slayden's personal letter of May 5th, regarding portrait statues and other subjects was also discussed, and later acknowledged by the Chairman in a personal reply.

7. BOONE TABLET FOR WASHINGTON, D. C. : H. J. Res. 162, 64th Congress, 1st Session, granting the Boone Trail Highway Association of North Carolina permission to place a tablet to the memory of Daniel Boone in the city of Washington, had been referred to the Commission by both the Committee on the Library of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. A photograph of the tablet was before the Commission. The monument was to take the form of a bas-relief 4 1/2 feet high and 2 feet wide, mounted on a boulder about 6 feet high. J. Hampton Rich, managing director of that Association had been in the office during the preceding week and had stated in writing that he wanted the memorial placed either in Hancock triangle on Pennsylvania Avenue or some equally important place on that Avenue; otherwise his association would not care to have it located in the Capital City.

The Commission advised that the tablet was unworthy as a work of art to be placed in the city of Washington, and that besides , a memorial of this character would be entirely unsuited for any such location on Pennsylvania Avenue since, among the formal and architectural surroundings of a great city, rocks and boulders are entirely unsuited as settings for tablets, reliefs, and other works of sculpture. See Exhibits F and G.

8. MEADE MEMORIAL: After a short interval for lunch, served in the office, the Commission met representatives of the Meade Memorial Commission of the State of Pennsylvania who presented a design for that memorial which is to be located in the Botanic Garden area. Mr. John W. Frazier and Mr. John B. Patrick were the representatives; they were accompanied by Messrs, Simon and Bassett, architects, and Charles Grafly, sculptor, all of Philadelphia, Pa., who had been selected and appointed by the Meade Memorial Commission to prepare a design.

The architect were requested to state their experiences in this and other architectural lines. Mr. Simon, speaking for himself and his partner Mr. Bassett, said that they were not graduates of any architectural college, but had studied architecture at home and under private tutors, and by dint of hard work and study had arrived to their present standing in their profession. He said their largest piece of executed work was probably the Manufacturers' Club in Philadelphia, but that the Meade Memorial was their first venture in monumental work. Mr. Bassett did not make any formal statement nor did Mr. Grafly.

The committee were then excused.

The design was disapproved and a detailed letter of criticism giving the reasons for such disapproval drawn up for transmittal. This is shown as Exhibit F.

9. TREATMENT OF LINCOLN MEMORIAL SURROUNDINGS: Mr. Henry Bacon, architect of the Lincoln Memorial, and Clarence W. Howard of Syracuse, New York, who had been engaged by the Office of Public Buildings and Grounds to prepare a satisfactory plan for the area lying between the Washington Monument and the Potomac River, appeared before the Commission at 3:30 o'clock with reference to a discussion of the treatment of the surroundings of the Memorial.

Mr. Bacon had been adhering steadfastly to a conclusion that the circular treatment of the immediate surroundings of the memorial was the proper one, but all members

of the Commission had not been entirely convinced of this. Mr. Howard had, accordingly, from time to time prepared and presented sketches of other possible means of treatment, one of which, showing a final conclusion on his part as to rectangular treatment, he presented as his final study at this time. After discussion, the circular form recommended by Mr. Bacon was approved for adoption, and his plans for the treatment of the immediate surroundings as submitted were accepted. The acceptance included the architect's selection of material for the terrace wall and steps which form part of the terrace according to the sample of stone he had before the meeting (Fox Island granite) or a ~~similar~~ lighter color.

Mr. Howard was requested to embody the circular form adopted in his plan for the remainder of the area, but it was suggested that he omit for the time being definite studies for the Bridge and Rock Creek approaches to the memorial, since these should be considered at a time when physical conditions had become more fixed at those points.

The Chairman read two telegrams which he had received from Mr. Gilbert in connection with the above matters.

Colonel Harts further mentioned that Mr. Bacon had stated it as his intention to submit the name of Jules Guerin to do the interior mural decorations on this memorial, and asked the Commission whether in their opinion he was the man to do this work. The Commission stated that they would accept Mr. Bacon's choice in this matter, and that Mr. Guerin would be a satisfactory executant. (See also minutes of New York Meeting.)

10. PROCTER PORTRAIT STATUE FOR SMITHSONIAN GROUNDS: S. 5186, 64th Congress, 1st Session, which had been referred for report by the Senate Committee on the Library, provided a pedestal and base for a portrait statue of William Procter, Jr., "The Father of American Pharmacy", which was proposed to be furnished by the American Pharmaceutical Association for emplacement in the Smithsonian Grounds. The sketch model for this portrait statue had been inspected by the Commission at a previous

meeting, at which time the representatives of the association stated they wanted to adhere to the portrait design adopted.

The Commission recommended that unfavorable action be taken on the bill, voicing their apprehension over the ever-increasing number of portrait statues that are offered for location in Washington. They added that a portrait statue in modern costume offers one of the most difficult artistic problems with which the sculptor has to contend, - difficulties which have been solved with success so rarely that it seems almost a foregone conclusion that any memorial of that type will be a blemish rather than an ornament to a city. See Exhibit I.

11. VALPARAISO, CHILE, MONUMENT: S. 1359, 64th Congress, 1st Session, provides for the erection of a suitable monument at Valparaiso, Chile, to the memory of the officers and sailors who were killed during the engagement between the United States ship Essex and the English ships Phoebe and Cherub in 1814.

A report was directed along the lines of a previous one on the same subject in which it was stated that, should Congress desire to provide for this monument, the amount specified in the bill, - $10,000, is inadequate for a worthy memorial. The Commission suggested further for the consideration of the Committee on the Library whether monuments of such a character, peculiarly commemorative of the bravery of our own people, had not better be erected within the borders of our own country. See Exhibit J.

12. POCAHONTAS MEMORIAL AT JAMESTOWN, VA: The next bill to receive consideration was S. 609, 64th Congress, 1st Session, to aid to the extend of $5,000 in the erection of a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Virginia. The Commission advised the Senate Committee on the Library, who had referred the bill for report, that, with the exception of a desirable change in one of the provisions, they saw no objection to the passage of the bill if Congress wished to render such assistance. They added however that the monument erected at Jamestown by the Government to commemorate the first

English settlement in the United States is still surrounded by a wooden fence, with no suitable approaches and neither planting nor other landscape setting worthy of the structure, and suggested the desirability of finishing the work laid out on an extensive scale before the United States contributes to the erection of another monument at that place. See Exhibit K.

13. MONUMENT TO JEFFERSON ON PROPOSED JEFFERSON HIGHWAY IN OKLAHOMA: Regarding S. J. Res. 123, 64th Congress, 1st Session, for the erection of a monument to Thomas Jefferson in a suitable place in a proposed park at one end of the proposed memorial concrete bridge across the Canadian River in Oklahoma on the proposed international Jefferson Highway, the Commission advised that the word "monument" be changed to "memorial" and that a provision be added making the design subject to the approval of the Commission. The Commission further suggested that, in view of the close relation the proposed monument will bear to the proposed bridge, the best artistic results would be subserved if the design of the bridge could also be referred to the Commission. See Exhibit L.

14. MONUMENT TO DANIEL BOONE AT CUMBERLAND GAP, TENN: The Commission advised the Senate Committee on the Library that they saw no objection to the form of S. 4906, 63d Congress, 3d Session, for a monument to Daniel Boone at Cumberland Gap, Tenn, if Congress desired to commemorate himby such a memorial, except that they would suggest that the word "monument" in the bill be changed to "memorial", and that a provision be added making the design subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. See Exhibit M.

15. MEMORIAL TABLET IN HONOR OF COLONEL GAILLARD IN AMPHITHEATER AT ARLINGTON: S. 5752, 64th Congress, 1st Session, referred for report by the Senate Committee on the Library, proposed granting the widow of Colonel David Du B. Gaillard authority to place in his memory a tablet in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington, Va. The discussion covered not only the question of placing this tablet but also other

similar memorials which undoubtedly will be proposed later on for location in that amphitheater. The Commission's reply recommended the passage of the bill under certain conditions, and also covered several other questions that arose quite fully. For this letter see Exhibit N.

16. BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG PAINTING: S. 2994, 64th Congress, 1st Session, proposed the acquisition of an oil painting of the Battle of Gettysburg, by James Walker, for the sum of $150,000, and had been referred for report by the Senate Committee on the Library. No report can be made until the painting has been inspected by the painter member of the Commission acting as a committee, and, as the painting in question cannot be located at present, the report had to be held over until such a time as the inspection can be made.

The members thereupon left the office, at 6:15 p. m., but met again the following morning at 9 o'clock.

17. NATIONAL ARCHIVES BUILDING: The Secretary of the Treasury had submitted for the comment and advice of the Commission sketches showing a preliminary scheme for a National Archives Building in Washington. He stated that, pending the selection of the site for this building, the scheme necessarily was limited to a general presentation of the problem, but that it showed the general character of the building which the Department proposes to construct if Congress enacts the necessary legislation. Mr. Louis A. Simon, of the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, appeared before the Commission at 10 o'clock Tuesday morning as the representative of the Treasury Department to make any explanations that might assist the Commission in arriving at their conclusion regarding the design. He emphasized the point that these sketches were intended primarily to establish basic requirements as to first steps in selecting a site and preparing estimates of cost for the project, and would be subject to considerable further study later on. The Commission found the

plans workable, and approved the sketches as a preliminary general scheme. It was pointed out, however, that the exterior design did not sufficiently express the special purpose of the building, since the architectural treatment is more fitted for one of the Executive Department buildings than for a building the bulk of which will be devoted to the storage of documents. They indicated that they would welcome submission of studies later on along the lines indicated, and felt certain that a design can be prepared expressive of the function to be subserved and still of such a dignity as will enable the building to take a place among the distinguished structures devoted to the purposes of the Government. See Exhibit O for report.

18. ENTRANCE TREATMENT FOR MONTROSE PARK: Colonel Harts submitted a number of sketches showing a study for an entrance treatment for Montrose Park (P.B.& G. 324.30 A & B) based upon suggestions and criticisms on former studies considered by Mr. Olmsted. Mr. Olmsted was appointed a committee with power, and the plan was approved subject to such changes as Mr. Olmsted would point out as desirable to Colonel Harts after studying the situation on the ground.

19. SEVENTEENTH STREET PLANTING PLAN: Colonel Harts also submitted a plan (P.B. & G. 1.25) for the landscape treatment of the area immediately south of the State, War, and Navy Department building based upon suggestions which Mr. Olmsted had made on former occasions after studying the plan on the ground. The plan was approved, subject to such changes as Mr. Olmsted would point out, as a committee with power, after inspecting the area again.

20. RESERVATIONS 28 and 29: A plan (P. B. & G. 324. 30 A & B) submitted by the Office of Public Buildings and Grounds for the landscape treatment of reservations 28 and 29 along Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., was approved subject to such modifications as Mr. Olmsted, as the committee with power, may consider desirable after an inspection on the ground.

21. HEIGHTS OF BUILDINGS BILLS: By direction of Senator Saulsbury, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Streets and Avenues of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, S. 3254, amending in general clause 3 of section 5 of the act of June 1, 1910, regulating the heights of buildings within the D. C., and S. 2695, regulating the heights of building along Sixteenth Street, both of 64th Congress, 1st Session, had been referred to the Commission for their views on the subject. Mr. Olmsted, as the committee in this matter, drafted a reply to Senator Saulsbury's Committee, which is shown under Exhibit P.

22. MEMORIAL TO JEAN D'ARC: Colonel Harts read a letter from Madame Carlo Polifeme, representing Le Lyceum Societe des Femmes de France a New York who propose to erect a monument to Jeanne d'Arc in the National Capital, asking for the grant of the site opposite the D. A. R. building for the erection of such a memorial. Colonel Harts was instructed to advise Madame Polifeme that the granting of permission to use such portions of the public lands has to be obtained from Congress in the shape of specific legislative enactment.. This was done.

23. GREAT FALLS POWER PROJECT POWER HOUSE: Colonel Flagler, District Officer in charge of the local United States Engineer Office, submitted for an opinion by the Commission a sketch for the power house and intake house to be erected near Chain Bridge for the propose Great Falls Water Power Development as described in House Document 1400/62/3. That report contains a design by a Mr. Herschel, which Colonel Flagler described as "much of the style of architecture prevalent in southern cotton mills on water power development". Colonel Flagler did not care for Mr. Herschel's design, and the sketch which he submitted showed a restudy in which "an effort was made to follow the lines of Norman Castle Architecture from examples obtained from the Library of Congress. It was necessary, however, to provide a very open facade in both the intake and power houses for light and air and the window and door features are taken from examples of Sicilian Norman

Ecclesiastic Architecture." Colonel Flagler added that it is doubtful if work will begin on this project for several years, and that his object in preparing this sketch was principally to bring to the attention of his successors the advisability of providing a structure in accord with the surroundings, for otherwise the matter might be overlooked and estimates prepared on Mr. Herschel's plans. Mr. Anderson was requested to prepare the report in this matter, which, after having received the approval of the other members by letter ballot, was to be transmitted to Colonel Flagler.

24. FRANCIS SCOTT KEY MEMORIAL COMPETITION: Colonel Harts informed the Commission that 34 models had been received by the Secretary of War in the Francis Scott Key memorial competition and set up in the New National Museum. He stated that the Jury of Award had made their recommendations to the Secretary of War, and that the latter, acting under the provisions of the programme of competition, had asked the advice of the Commission with respect to the Jury's award. The Commission left the office and proceeded to the New National Museum. After an inspection of the models and hearing the recommendations of the Jury, they recommended the acceptance and approval of the Jury's recommendations. The Jury's report is attached under Exhibit Q. It was later learned that Chas. H. Niehaus' design was awarded the competition.

25. MISCELLANEOUS: After leaving the Museum, the members proceeded to the Aqueduct Bridge for an inspection of the surroundings in connection with the provision of the new Act Public No 82, 64th Congress, providing for the removal of what is now known as the Aqueduct Bridge across the Potomac River and for the building of a bridge in place thereof. This act provides "The Secretary of War shall advise with the Commission of Fine Arts in regard to the location, plans and specifications of said bridge and approaches.". The Act had not passed at the time of the meeting and therefore the matter was not before the Commission officially, so nothing more was done than become acquainted with certain physical conditions at the site.

Leaving the Aqueduct Bridge the members proceeded along the lower part of Arlington Cemetery across the Highway Bridge through the Mall to the Capitol where they had a luncheon engagement at 1 o'clock with Senator Newlands at his office. Besides the members of the Commission and Colonel Harts, Colonel Katz, Engineer Commissioner, D. C., and Senator Williams, Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Library, and James L. Slayden, Chairman of the House Committee on the Library, were present.

After luncheon the members of the Commission took a taxi for an inspection of Mount Hamilton, thence to Truxton Circle for an inspection of the planting recently installed by the Office of Public Buildings and Grounds, from there to McMillan Park for a visit to the McMillan Memorial fountain, from there through the Filtration Plant along the reservoir to the proposed site for the Asbury Memorial at Sixteenth Street and Columbia Road, and from there across the Q street Bridge to Montrose Park where considerable time was spent in going over the grounds. The Commission then adjourned for the day.

26. Mr. Moore, Mr. Olmsted, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Blashfield met at the office at 9 o'clock Wednesday morning for the disposition of a number of reports. These being taken care of, they left for the Lincoln Memorial, accompanied by Colonel Harts and Mr. J. G. Langdon, consulting landscape architect employed by the Office of Public Buildings and Grounds, and spent some time there discussing and studying certain phases of the treatment of the landscape surroundings.

After this inspection which lasted until noon, they adjourned subject to the call of the Chairman.

Approved: Charles Moore

Chairman

Clark Harts

COLONEL, U. S. ARMY

Washington, D. C.,

May 18, 1916.

My dear Mr. Walcott:

The plans for the building for the Freer collections which is proposed for erection in the southwest corner of the Smithsonian Park at 12th and B sts., SW., to which you refer in your letter of April 26th, were approved by the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting last Monday, The Commission also approved the location of the building on the site selected by the Smithsonian Institute.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely, yours,

WM. V HARRIS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

C. D. Walcott, Esq.,

Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

Washington, D. C.,

May 18, 1916.

My dear Mr. Walcott:

The plans for the building for the Freer collection which is proposed for erection in the northwest corner of the Smithsonian Park at 12th and B sts., SW., to which you refer in your letter of April 26th, were approved by the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting last Monday. The Commission also approved the location of the building on the site selected by the Smithsonian Institute.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

WM. V. KELLEN.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

C. D. Walcott, Esq.,

Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

(M)

329

Washington, D. C.,
May 17, 1916.

My dear Mr. Platt:

Since the close of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts I have been looking into the matter of the probable ultimate grades of the Mall in the vicinity of the Freer Museum. I cannot yet give you any definite information because, as I explained when you were here, the final determination of these grades has been postponed again and again in the absence of a complete and accurate survey of the existing conditions. The survey is not yet made but is at last well under way and is promised in about five weeks.

I have examined some tentative profiles for the Mall which were hastily prepared in Mr. McKim's office at some date between the disbanding of the Park Commission and Mr. McKim's death. I think they were prepared at the time when the Department of Agriculture building was about to be built and that they served as a basis for setting that building as far below the present surface of the ground as was done. According to these tentative profiles there would be a cut of over three to four feet below the present surface on a line 75 feet north of the Freer Museum.

As I have said above, these tentative profiles were hastily prepared by Mr. McKim under pressure and without proper data, and my present impression is that the final profile will not call for so much cut at this point. I am authorized to say that you will be safe in adjusting the building to fit the existing surface of the ground, with the expectation that a low terrace, certainly not exceeding 4 feet in height, may be needed around or in front of the building in case it should be decided that that Mall road is fixed at a level below the present surface.

In the case of the Department of Agriculture building it was felt that it would be undesirable to set the building on the existing surface as I have just suggested for the Freer Museum. But the case was quite different. Mr. McKim rightly felt that it would be a mistake to set the Department of Agriculture building at such a height that it would ultimately be raised upon a terrace above the highest part of the road between the Capitol and the Monument, because the building was planned to be 5 stories in height above the basement and surmounted by a dome. It is obvious that the same objection would not apply to raising the Freer Gallery on a low terrace.

I hope that the Commission will be in a position to make a more definite opinion about the Mall grades at its next meeting early in July.

Sincerely, yours,

FREDERICK LAW OLMSTED.

ABC

Charles A. Platt, Esq.,
101 Park avenue,
New York City.

Washington, D. C.,
May 17, 1910.

My dear Mr. Platt:

Since the close of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts I have been looking into the matter of the probable ultimate grades of the Mall in the vicinity of the Freer Museum. I cannot yet give you any definite information because, as explained when you were here, the final determination of these grades has been postponed again and again in the absence of a complete and accurate survey of the existing conditions. The survey is not yet made but is at last well under way and is expected in about five weeks.

I have examined some tentative profiles for the Mall which would practically preserve Mr. McKim's office at some date between the disbanding of the Park Commission and Mr. McKim's death. I think they were prepared at the time when the Department of Agriculture building was about to be built and that they served as a basis for getting that building as far below the present surface of the ground as was done. According to these tentative profiles there would be a cut of over three feet below the present surface on a line 75 feet north of the Freer Museum.

As I have said above, these tentative profiles were hastily prepared by Mr. [illegible] under pressure and without proper data, and my present impression is that due [illegible] profile will not call for so much cut at this point. I am authorized to say that you will be able in adjusting the building to fit the existing surface of the ground, with the expectation that a low terrace, certainly not exceeding 4 feet in height, may be needed around or in front of the building in case it should be decided that the Mall road is fixed at a level below the present surface.

In the case of the Department of Agriculture building it was felt that it would be undesirable to set the building on the existing surface as I have just suggested for the Freer Museum. Put the case was quite different. Mr. McKim rightly felt that it would be a mistake to set the Department of Agriculture building at such a height that it would ultimately be raised upon a terrace above the highest part of the road between the Capitol and the Monument, because the building will ultimately be [illegible] stories in height above the basement and surrounded by a deep. It is obvious that the same objection would not apply to raising the Freer Gallery on a low terrace.

I hope that the Commission will be in a position to make a more definite opinion about the Mall grades at its next meeting early in July.

Sincerely yours,

PRESIDING LAW OFFICER.

ARC

[illegible] A. Platt, Esq.,
[illegible] Park Avenue,
[illegible] York City.

Washington, D. C.,

May 23, 1916.

My dear Colonel:

The Commission of Fine Arts have examined the design for the proposed guard ~~rxix~~ fence in McMillan Park at the intersection of Reservoir Road and Michigan Avenue submitted with your communication of May fourth, and have also examined the site for the proposed structure.

In case such a combination of pipe and concrete, as shown, is to be adhered to, the Commission would recommend that the design be modified by making the posts wider and taller, with simplified cap, the iron rail being held between posts instead of extending across the top of the posts.

The Commission, however, would prefer that a solid concrete wall of appropriate design be erected to the necessary height at this point, following possibly the simple design for such a wall adopted along the Avenida Beira-Mar skirting the bay in Rio de Janeiro, a photograph of which is attached for your information.

By direction of the Commission:

Very truly, yours,

WM W HARTS

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Lieut. Col., C. C. F. Flagler,
Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.,
In charge, United States Engineer Office.

ABC

Washington, D. C.,

May 28, 1910.

My dear Colonel:

The Commission of Fine Arts have examined the design for the proposed guard xxxx fence in McMillan Park at the intersection of Reservoir Road and Michigan Avenue submitted with your communication of May fourth, and have also examined the site for the proposed structure.

In case such a combination of pipe and concrete, as shown, is to be adhered to, the Commission would recommend that the design be modified by making the posts wider and taller, with simplified cap, the iron rail being held between posts instead of extending across the top of the posts.

The Commission, however, would prefer that a solid concrete wall of appropriate design be erected to the necessary height at this point, following possibly the simple design for such a wall adopted along the Avenida Beira-Mar skirting the bay in Rio de Janeiro, a photograph of which is attached for your information.

By direction of the Commission:

Very truly yours,

WM T EMMONS

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Lieut. Col., C. E. Ringler,
Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.,
In charge, United States Engineer Office,

ABC

Washington, D. C.,
May 22, 1916.

My dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts advise the committee on the Asbury Memorial that they have been much interested in the sketches submitted for their consideration. The Commission appreciate the spirit in which your Committee has presented the matter of this memorial, and desire in every way to help you to obtain a result such as you desire. With the view of facilitating your work the following suggestion is made.

As you know, Congress alone has the power to permit the erection of memorials in the parks and reservations; and while there would seem to be no question as to the grant of such permission by Congress, the proper approach is now through that body. In order to facilitate matters there is enclosed herewith the draft of a bill in the general form of such measures. It is suggested that you have this bill introduced in either the House or the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Library. It is the custom of that committee to refer such bills to the Commission, and at that time the Commission will advise with you further.

By direction of the Commission:

Very truly, yours,

WM. W. HARTS

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

H. K. Carroll, Esq.,
Secretary, Francis Asbury Memorial Association,
1114 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

ABC

Washington, D. C.,

May 25, 1916.

My dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts advises the Committee on the Asbury Memorial that they have been much interested in the sketches submitted for their consideration. The Commission appreciates the spirit in which your Committee has presented the matter of this memorial, and desire in every way to help you to obtain a result such as you desire. With the view of facilitating your work the following suggestion is made.

As you know, Congress alone has the power to permit the erection of memorials in the parks and reservations; and while there would seem to be no question as to the grant of such permission by Congress, the proper application is now through that body. In order to facilitate matters there is enclosed herewith the draft of a bill in the usual form of such measures. It is suggested that you have this bill introduced in either the House or the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Library. It is the custom of that committee to refer such bills to the Commission, and at that time the Commission will advise with you further.

By direction of the Commission:

Very truly yours,

[redacted]

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

H. K. Carroll, Esq.,
Secretary, Pyramis Asbury Memorial Association,
1114 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

ASC

May 18, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts recognize fully the desirability of commemorating the part played by John Ericsson as a naval architect who, after a long and honorable service, designed and secured the completion of a vessel which turned the scale in a naval engagement of supreme importance to the country, and also formed the basis for a transformation of naval architecture.

The very importance of this service suggests that its commemoration offers an unusual opportunity to the artist and that he should not be restricted to so limited an expression as a portrait statue. The best results not only as an honor to a great inventor but also as an adornment for the Capital City would be attained by selecting a suitable site (preferably on the water front) and then giving the artist full scope for his imagination. The memorial would then take a form both appropriate and significant.

The sum of $100,000 mentioned in the Bill (H. R. 6050, 64th Congress, 1st Session) should be adequate to secure the result desired. The Commission suggest that the bill be amended by adding thereto the following:

"The site and design of the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts."

Respectfully,

(Signed) CHARLES MOORE.

Chairman.

Hon. James L. Slayden,
Chairman, Committee on the Library
of the House of Representatives.

May 18, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts recognizes fully the desirability of commemorating the part played by John Ericsson as a naval architect who, after a long and honorable service, designed and secured the completion of a vessel which turned the scale in a naval engagement of supreme importance to the country, and also formed the basis for a transformation of naval architecture.

The very importance of this service suggests that its commemoration offers an unusual opportunity to the artist and that he should not be restricted to so limited an expression as a portrait statue. The best results not only as an honor to a great inventor but also as an adornment for the Capital City would be attained by selecting a suitable site (preferably on the water front) and then giving the artist full scope for his imagination. The memorial would then take a form both appropriate and significant.

The sum of $100,000 mentioned in the Bill (H. R. 6050, 64th Congress, 1st Session) should be adequate to secure the result desired. The Commission suggest that the Bill be amended by adding thereto the following:

"The site and design of the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts."

Respectfully,

(Signed) CHARLES MOORE.

Chairman.

Hon. James R. Mann,
Chairman, Committee on the Library
of the House of Representatives.

Washington, D. C.,
May 18, 1916.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, during their meeting held this week, gave careful consideration to H. J. Res. 162, 64th Congress, 1st Session, permitting the placing of a tablet in the city of Washington to the memory of Daniel Boone, which was referred to them for report by your letter of May 5th last. The Commission had before them a photograph of the final full-size model of the tablet which, approximately 4 feet 6 inches in height by 2 feet in width, is to be affixed to a boulder about 6 feet high. A duplicate photograph is enclosed for your information.

The Commission understand from J. Hampton Rich, the director of the Boone Trail Highway Association of North Carolina, that the promoters of the project desire to have this tablet placed in the triangular reservation on Pennsylvania Avenue in which the Hancock monument is now located, or at least at some equally prominent point on that Avenue. In the opinion of the Commission a memorial of this character would be entirely unsuited for any such location on Pennsylvania Avenue, and that, furthermore, among the formal and architectural surroundings of a great city, rocks and boulders are entirely unsuited as settings for tablets, reliefs, and other works of sculpture.

The tablet itself is, in the opinion of the Commission, unworthy as a work of art to be placed in the city of Washington. They would therefore recommend that unfavorable action be taken by your Committee on the bill. This recommendation is made on artistic grounds alone, without regard to the importance of the work and life it is desired to commemorate.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM .W . HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

Hon. James L. Slayden,
Chairman, Committee on the Library
of the House of Representatives.

Exhibited by Senate Committee on the Library.

Washington, D. C.,
May 10, 1910.

ar Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, during their meeting held this week, gave
rel consideration to H. J. Res. 162, 60th Congress, 1st Session, permitting
e placing of a tablet in the city of Washington to the memory of Daniel Boone,
ich was referred to them for report by your letter of May 5th last. The
mmission had before them a photograph of the final full-size model of the
blet which, approximately 4 feet 6 inches in height by 2 feet in width, is to
attixed to a boulder about 6 feet high. A duplicate photograph is enclosed
r your information.

The Commission understand from J. Hampton Rich, the Director of the Boone
tional Highway Association of North Carolina, that the promoters of the project
sire to have this tablet placed in the triangular reservation on Pennsylvania
enue in which the Hancock monument is now located, or at least at some equally
ominent point on that Avenue. In the opinion of the Commission a memorial
this character would be entirely unsuited for any such location on Pennsylvania
enue, and that, furthermore, owing the formal and architectural surroundings of
reat city, parks and boulevards are entirely unsuited as settings for tablets,
lls, and other works of sculpture.

The tablet itself is, in the opinion of the Commission, unworthy as a work
art to be placed in the city of Washington. They would therefore recommend
at unfavorable action be taken by your Committee on the bill. This recommen-
tion is made on artistic grounds alone, without regard to the importance of the
n and life it is desired to commemorate.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. V. HASKS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

on. James R. Mann,
airman, Committee on the Library
f the House of Representatives.

Washington, D. C.,

May 17, 1916.

Sir:

After careful consideration of the design presented by your Commission for the Meade Memorial, the Commission of Fine Arts disapprove it for erection on the site proposed.

The chief reasons for this decision, which ought to be borne in mind in the preparation of a new design, are as follows:

1. If the mass of masonry is regarded primarily as a background to the sculptured figure of Meade and the main interest of the memorial is to be focussed on that figure, as is suggested by the architectural forms, the relation in its size and scale between the sculpture and the masonry background is such that the figure of Meade would, in the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts, appear unfortunately belittled.

2. If the mass of masonry is in itself intended as the main center of interest, the figure of Meade being regarded merely as a decorative and explanatory ornament, the architectural forms and the relation between the mass of masonry and the sculpture do not express this conception successfully.

3. In any case the aggressive predominance of the architectural element of the design both in relation to the sculpture of the Meade Memorial and in relation to the Grant Memorial is, in the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts, fundamentally mistaken.

4. The site, although from its importance and its location admirably suited to the subject of a Meade Memorial, is one that imposes certain special artistic conditions that have not been realized in this design.

For example:

A memorial on this site cannot successfully be treated as though the only important points of view were from the south. It will be seen by even more people from Pennsylvania Avenue to which this design would present a back view.

In the second place, it will be seen in connection with the Grant Memorial.

In the third place the design should be such that it can be successfully balanced in the future by a memorial of somewhat similar type upon the corresponding site

Washington, D. C.,

May 17, 1916.

After careful consideration of the design presented by your Commission for the
Memorial, the Commission of Fine Arts disapprove it for execution on the site proposed.

The chief reasons for this decision, which ought to be borne in mind in the prep-
ion of a new design, are as follows:

1. If the mass of masonry is regarded primarily as a background to the sculptured
e of Verde and the main interest of the memorial is to be focussed on that figure,
e suggested by the architectural forms, the relation in its size and scale between the
ture and the masonry background is such that the figure of Verde would, in the
on of the Commission of Fine Arts, appear unfortunately belittled.

2. If the mass of masonry is in itself intended as the main center of interest,
figure of Verde being regarded merely as a decorative and explanatory ornament, the
itectural forms and the relation between the mass of masonry and the sculpture do not
ss this conception successfully.

3. In any case the aggressive predominance of the architectural element of the
n both in relation to the sculpture of the Verde Memorial and in relation to the
t Memorial is, in the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts, fundamentally mistaken.

4. The site, although from its importance and its location admirably suited to the
ject of a Verde Memorial, is one that imposes certain special artistic conditions that
not been realized in this design.

For example:

A memorial on this site cannot successfully be treated as though the only im-
nt points of view were from the south. It will be seen by even more people from
Fifth Avenue to which this design would present a back view.

In the second place, it will be seen in connection with the Grant Memorial.

In the third place the design should be such that it can be successfully
ced in the future by a memorial of somewhat similar type upon the corresponding site

to the south of the Capitol axis, and yet not produce a strikingly incomplete and one-sided effect in the absence of such balancing memorial.

The design submitted calls emphatically for a balancing memorial of closely similar type, as indicated on the general plan submitted by the designers; but such a future memorial could not be successfully executed because its principal sculpture would be completely in the shade on the north side of the great block of masonry.

The Commission looks for a restudy of the problem along these lines; the development of the Meade Memorial as a constituent part of the great square in front of the United States Capitol, with more importance given to Meade and less aggressive architectural setting.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Mr. John W. Frazier,
Secretary, Meade Memorial Commission
of the State of Pennsylvania,
404 Weightman Building,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

AEC

be south of the Capitol axis, and yet not produce a strikingly incomplete and one-

d effect in the absence of such balancing memorial.

The design submitted calls emphatically for a balancing memorial of closely similar

, as indicated on the general plan submitted by the designers; but such a future

rial could not be successfully executed because its principal sculpture would be con-

ely in the shade on the north side of the great block masonry.

The Commission looks for a remedy of the problem along these lines; the develop-

he Meade Memorial as a constituent part of the great square in front of the United

as Capitol, with more importance given to Meade and less aggressive architectural

ing.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

John W. Frazier,
etary, Meade Memorial Commission
he State of Pennsylvania,
Weightman Building,
adelphia, Pennsylvania.

Washington, D. C.,
May 20, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, after careful consideration of S. 5186, 64th Congress, 1st Session, "to provide for the erection of a pedestal and base for a monument to William Procter, junior, in the Smithsonian Grounds at Washington, D. C.", which was referred to them for report by your Committee on May 4th last, recommend that unfavorable action be taken on the bill for the following reasons:

The Commission view with deep apprehension the ever-increasing number of portrait statues that are offered for location in Washington. Every memorial erected in the Capital should be a work of art, properly related to its surroundings. A portrait statue in modern costume offers one of the most difficult artistic problems with which the sculptor has to contend,- difficulties which have been solved with success so rarely that it seems almost a foregone conclusion that any memorial of that type will be a blemish rather than an ornament to a city.

The Commission understand that it is proposed to erect two new buildings on the Smithsonian Grounds, as well as eventually to remove some existing buildings. Any new monument in that section should therefore be designed and located with regard to those proposed changes and the modified surroundings. It would be unwise to attempt to locate any statue or memorial there until plans for these changes have been developed. The Commission would like to add that this conclusion has been reached without any consideration of the question as to whether or not this would be the most fitting location for a memorial to the person it is intended to commemorate.

In this connection the Commission would like to call attention to a report made by them on December 2, 1914, to the Committee on the Library of the United States Senate in which the following suggestion is made:

> ".....that the whole subject of the adornment of Washington by commemorative works of art be referred to a body to be created for that purpose by Congress, and that one or more historians of recognized standing be appointed to act with representatives of the Government in formulating a plan of procedure. With such a body the Commission of Fine Arts would be pleased to act in so far as their advice on matters of art might be required. ".

The Commission believe that the time has come when it is very important that such a study be seriously undertaken.

Respectfully,

(SIGNED) CHARLES MOORE.

Chairman.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,
May 20, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, after careful consideration of S. 5186, 64th Congress, 1st Session, "to provide for the erection of a pedestal and base for a monument to William Prosser, Junior, in the Smithsonian Grounds at Washington, D. C.", which was referred to them for report by your Committee on May 4th last, recommend that unfavorable action be taken on the bill for the following reasons:

The Commission view with deep apprehension the ever-increasing number of portrait statues that are offered for location in Washington. Every memorial erected in the capital should be a work of art, properly related to its surroundings. A portrait statue in modern costume offers one of the most difficult artistic problems with which a sculptor has to contend,- difficulties which have been solved with success so rarely that it see reasonable a foregone conclusion that any memorial of that type will be a blemish rather than an ornament to a city.

The Commission understand that it is proposed to erect two new buildings on the Smithsonian Grounds, as well as eventually to remove some existing buildings. Any monument in that section should therefore be designed and located with regard to those proposed changes and the modified surroundings. It would be unwise to attempt to locate any statue or memorial there until plans for these changes have been developed. The Commission would like to add that this commission has been asked without any consideration of the question as to whether or not this would be the most fitting location for a memorial to the person it is intended to commemorate.

In this connection the Commission would like to call attention to a report made by them on December 3, 1914, to the Committee on the Library of the United States Senate in which the following suggestion is made:

> "..... that the whole subject of the adornment of Washington by commemorative works of art be referred to a body to be created for that purpose by Congress, and that one or more historians of recognized standing be appointed to act with representatives of the Government in formulating a plan of procedure. With such a body the Commission of Fine Arts would be pleased to act in so far as their advice on matters of art might be required. "

The Commission believe that the time has come when it is very important that such a study be seriously undertaken.

Respectfully,

(SIGNED) CHARLES MOORE,

Chairman.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,
May 23, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S. 1359, 64th Congress, 1st Session, authorizing the Secretary of War to erect at Valparaiso, Chile, a suitable monument to the memory of the officers and sailors who were killed during the engagement between the United States ship Essex and the English ships Phoebe and Cherub in 1814.

The Commission are of opinion that, should Congress desire to provide for this monument, the amount specified in the bill, namely, ten thousand dollars, is inadequate since the monument should be of a dignity worthy of this country. The Commission would further suggest that the word "monument" appearing in the bill be changed to "memorial", the latter term permitting of treatment along broader lines; and that the design for the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts in order to protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design.

The Commission feel that such a memorial would undoubtedly have an international value in promoting the friendship between this country and Chile, and would at the same time commemorate a brave action participated in by our Navy. Nevertheless it occurred to them that, however gratifying it might be to this country and to Chile, it might create unpleasant feelings with our great neighbor England; and for that reason they wish to submit whether monuments of such a character, which are so peculiarly commemorative of the bravery of our own people, might not better be placed within the borders of our own country.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

ABC

Washington, D. C.,
May 6, 1910.

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the receipt, for report, of S. [illegible], 61th Congress, 1st Session, authorizing the Secretary of War to accept [illegible]ersing, Chile, a suitable monument to the memory of the officers and sailors [illegible] were killed during the engagement between the United States ship Essex and the [illegible]ilian ships Esmeralda and Chacabuco in 1814.

The Commission are of opinion that, should Congress desire to provide for this [illegible]ment, the amount specified in the bill, namely, ten thousand dollars, is in- [illegible]ufficient since the monument should be of a dignity worthy of this country. The [illegible]mission would further suggest that the word "monument" appearing in the bill be [illegible]anged to "memorial", the latter term permitting of treatment along broader lines; [illegible] that the design for the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the [illegible]mmission of Fine Arts in order to protect the United States from the selection of [illegible]unsuitable design.

The Commission feel that such a memorial would unquestionably have an inter- [illegible]national value in promoting the friendship between this country and Chile, and [illegible]uld at the same time commemorate a brave action participated in by our Navy. [illegible]Nevertheless it occurred to them that, however gratifying it might be to this [illegible]country and to Chile, it might create unpleasant feelings with our great neighbor [illegible]sland; and for that reason they wish to submit whether monuments of such a [illegible]character, which are so peculiarly commemorative of the bravery of our own people, [illegible]ght not better be placed within the borders of our own country.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

[illegible] W. HEATH.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

[illegible] Chairman,
[illegible]mittee on the Library,
[illegible]ted States Senate.

May 15, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S. 609, 64th Congress, 1st Session, "to aid in the erection of a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Virginia," by an appropriation of $5,000.

It is understood that the site for the proposed monument has been chosen and that the base is already in place. The Commission sees no objection to the form of the bill, if Congress deems it desirable to aid in the erection of the statue to be placed on this base, with one exception, - they would suggest that the provision beginning in line 13, page 2, and extending into line 17, page 2, be modified to read:

> .....Provided further, That the design of said monument shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts;.....

Such a provision would sufficiently protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design, and prevent the necessity of a collective approval by the three bodies now stated in that provision of the bill.

It may be added that in October, 1915, three members of the Commission visited Jamestown, and inspected the monuments and other memorials on that historic site. The important monument erected by the Government to commemorate the first English settlement in the United States is still surrounded by a wooden fence. There are no suitable approaches to the monument and neither planting nor other landscape setting worthy of the structure. It would seem desirable that either the Government or some other authority first finish the work laid out on an extensive scale, but halted at a point which gives an unfinished and incomplete appearance to the place before the United States contributes towards the erection of another monument at that place.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

ABC

May 15, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S. 609, 64th Congress, 1st Session, "to aid in the erection of a monument to Confederates at Jamestown, Virginia," by an appropriation of $5,000.

It is understood that the site for the proposed monument has been chosen and that the base is already in place. The Commission sees no objection to the form of the bill, if Congress leave it desirable to aid in the erection of the statue to be placed on this base, with one exception - they would suggest that the provision beginning in line 10, page 1, and extending into line 17, page 2, be modified to read:

.....Provided further, That the design of said monument shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts;.....

Such a provision would sufficiently protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design, and prevent the necessity of a collective approval by the three bodies now stated in that provision of the bill.

It may be added that in October, 1915, three members of the Commission visited Jamestown, and inspected the monuments and other memorials on that historic site. The important monument erected by the Government to commemorate the first English settlement in the United States is still surrounded by a wooden fence. There are no suitable approaches to the monument and neither plan ting nor other landscape setting worthy of its structure. It would seem desirable that either the Government or some other authority first finish the work laid out on an extensive scale, but halted at a point which gives an unfinished and incomplete appearance to the place before the United States contributes towards the erection of another monument at that place.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

W. MCMILLAN.

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Enc

Washington, D. C.,

May 18, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S. J. Res. 123, 64th Congress, 1st Session, for the erection of a monument to Thomas Jefferson to be constructed in a suitable place in a park proposed to be made at one end of the proposed memorial concrete bridge across the Canadian River in Oklahoma on the proposed international Jefferson Highway.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress deem it desirable to erect a monument to Thomas Jefferson in the location adverted to, from the artistic side it would seem advisable to insert a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission Of Fine Arts. Such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design. In view of the close relation the proposed monument will bear to the proposed bridge, the Commission feel that the best artistic results would be achieved for the monument and its setting if the design of the bridge could also be referred to the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission further suggest that the word "monument" appearing in the bill be changed to "memorial", the latter term permitting of treatment along broader lines.

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

ABC

Washington, D. C.,

May 10, 1926.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledges the reference, for report, of S. J. Res. 123, 69th Congress, 1st Session, for the erection of a monument to Thomas Jefferson to be constructed in a suitable place in a park proposed to be made at one end of the proposed memorial concrete bridge across the Potomac River in Oklahoma on the proposed International Boulevard Highway.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress deem it desirable to erect a monument to Thomas Jefferson in the location advocated, from the artistic side it would be advisable to insert a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. Such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design. In view of the close relation the proposed monument will bear to the proposed bridge, the Commission feel that the best artistic results would be achieved for the monument and its setting if the design of the bridge could also be referred to the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission further suggest that the word "monument" appearing in the bill be changed to "memorial", the latter term permitting of treatment along broader lines.

Respectfully,

W. A. HARPER.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

ALC

Washington, D. C.,

May 15, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S. 4906, 63d Congress, 3d Session, providing for a suitable memorial to Daniel Boone at Cumberland Gap, Tennessee.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress deem it desirable to erect a monument to Daniel Boone at that place, from the artistic side it would seem advisable to insert a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. Such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design. The Commission further suggest that the word "monument" appearing in the Bill be changed to "memorial", the latter term permitting of treatment along broader lines.

Respectfully, yours,

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

ABC

340

Washington, D. C.,

May 22, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference to them for report of the bill (S. 5752, 64th Congress, 1st Session), granting to the widow of Colonel David Du B. Gaillard authority to place in his memory a tablet in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington, Virginia.

This bill is the first of a number of bills which undoubtedly will be introduced for like purposes. The memorial in question would seem to be in the category of memorials which will appropriately find a place in the Memorial Amphitheater.

It is understood that the above bill has been recommended for amendment by the War Department as follows: ...The design, character, and location of the tablet shall be subject to the approval of the commission under whose direction the building is being erected... . This Commission therefore recommend the passage of the bill amended so as to place the determination of design and location of the proposed tablet in the hands of the authorities charged by law with the erection of the Memorial Amphitheater.

In view of the future applications for the placing of like tablets, the Commission of Fine Arts suggest that a systematic and orderly determination of the propriety of placing such memorials, and the design and location of the same, should have preliminary consideration by a board of persons especially charged with that duty, Congress reserving to itself the final determination. It is understood that the War Department has already taken steps for the introduction of such a bill, a copy of which is attached for the information of your committee.

In order that the character and purpose of the Memorial Amphitheater may be clearly known, the Commission submits for your information and files the attached statement made by the Architect in the April, 1916, number of Art and Archaeology.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer

The Chairman,
Senate Committee on the Library,

70

340

Washington, D. C.,

May 25, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledges the reference to them for report of the bill (S. 6752, 64th Congress, 1st Session), granting to the widow of Colonel David B. Gilliard authority to place in His memory a tablet in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington, Virginia.

This bill is the first of a number of bills which undoubtedly will be introduced for like purpose. The memorial in question would seem to be in the category of memorials which will appropriately find a place in the Memorial Amphitheater.

It is understood that the above bill has been recommended for amendment by the War Department as follows: ...The design, character, and location of the tablet shall be subject to the approval of the Commission under whose direction the building is being erected... The Commission therefore recommend the passage of the bill amended so as to place the determination of design and location of the proposed tablet in the hands of the authorities charged by law with the erection of the Memorial Amphitheater.

In view of the future applications for the placing of like tablets, the Commission of Fine Arts suggest that a systematic and orderly determination of the propriety of placing such memorials, and the design and location of the same, should have preliminary consideration by a board of persons especially charged with that duty, Congress reserving to itself the final determination. It is understood that the War Department has already taken steps for the introduction of such a bill, a copy of which is attached for the information of your committee.

In order that the character and purpose of the Memorial Amphitheater may be clearly known, the Commission submits for your information and files the attached statement made for the Architect in the April, 1916, number of Art and Archaeology.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. V. KELLY.

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Senate Committee on the Library,

Washington, D. C., 311

May 22, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting last Tuesday, gave careful consideration to the sketches showing a preliminary scheme for a National Archives Building in Washington which had been referred to them for comment and advice by the Secretary of the Treasury with letter of May 8, 1916.

The Commission understand that these sketches are intended primarily to establish basic requirements as to first steps in selecting a site and preparing estimates of cost for this project. It is also understood that the plan of the building was prepared after advising with experts as to the various requirements of a depository for public documents, subject to consultation by Government officials and students of history, economics, &c. The plan seems workable.

The exterior design does not sufficiently express the special purpose of the building. The architectural treatment is more fitted for one of the Executive Department buildings than for a building four-fifths of which will be devoted to the storage of documents. The problem is by no means an easy one; but it should be undertaken at once and carried to a satisfactory conclusion during the progress of legislation providing for the construction of an Archives Building. This Commission will welcome the submission of studies along the lines above indicated; and they feel certain that a design can be prepared expressive at once of the function to be subserved and still of such a dignity as will enable the building to take a place among the distinguished structures devoted to the purposes of the Government.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Honorable

The Vice-President.

Washington, D. C.,

May 22, 1916.

:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting last Tuesday, gave careful consider-
ion to the sketches showing a preliminary scheme for a National Archives Building in
shington which had been referred to them for comment and advice by the Secretary of
Treasury with letter of May 8, 1916.

The Commission understand that these sketches are intended primarily to estab-
sic requirements as to first steps in selecting a site and preparing estimates of cost
r this project. It is also understood that the plan of the building was prepared
er advising with experts as to the various requirements of a depository for public
uments, subject to consultation by Government officials and students of history,
norics, &c. The plan seems workable.

The exterior design does not sufficiently express the special purpose of the build-
g. The architectural treatment is more fitted for one of the Executive Departments
ldings than for a building four-fifths of which will be devoted to the storage of
uments. The problem is by no means an easy one; but it should be undertaken at
e and carried to a satisfactory conclusion during the progress of legislation pro-
ing for the construction of an Archives Building. This Commission will welcome the
mission of studies along the lines above indicated; and they feel certain that a
ign can be prepared expressive at once of the function to be subserved and still of
h a dignity as will enable the building to take a place among the distinguished
ructures devoted to the purposes of the Government.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. V. WALTON

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

Honorable

Vice-President.

Washington, D. C.

June 2, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to S. 2695 and S. 3254, both 64th Congress, 1st Session, relating to the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, which were submitted for their views with the letter dated March 2, 1916, by your Subcommittee.

In the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts it is highly desirable to amend the present law regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia in such a manner as to fix a lower limit than at present upon the heights of buildings, both upon Sixteenth Street and upon many other streets, chiefly in residential districts.

There are, however, certain objections to the bills in question.

If any amendment of the act in general terms can be adopted which will incidentally accomplish the desired end as regards Sixteenth Street it would obviously be unnecessary to pass a special act like S. 2695 relating to Sixteenth Street only.

The principal objection to S. 3254 as drawn is that it leaves unchanged the present definition of "residence streets" while making an important arbitrary reduction in the maximum height limitation for such streets. As now defined in the law, "residence street" applies indiscriminately to a street of apartment houses of the usual type supplied with elevator service and also to a street of private houses not over four stories in height. The limiting height of 70 feet specified in S. 3254 is on the one hand greater than is necessary or appropriate for ordinary private houses or for multifamily houses unprovided with elevators; and on the other hand it is believed to be too low to permit a normally economical development and operation of elevator apartment houses.

Exhibit P-

Washington, D. C.

June 6, 1916.

Sir:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have received petitions to [illegible] and H. 6000, both bills numbered [illegible], relating to the number of [illegible] in the District of Columbia, which were submitted for their views, also the letter dated March 6, 1916, of your Committee.

By the opinion of the Municipality of this city it is highly necessary to amend the present law relating the salary of [illegible] in the District of Columbia in such a manner as to fix a lower limit than is [illegible] upon the height of buildings, both upon different streets and upon other streets.

There are, however, certain objections to the bills in question.

If any amendment of the law in general terms can be adopted which will [illegible] accomplish the desired end an objection thereto it would obviously be unnecessary to [illegible] the [illegible] to different streets only.

The principal objection to the bill as drawn is that it [illegible] the present relations of "residence districts" and the building [illegible] by reducing in the maximum height limitation for such districts. As now worded it [illegible] applies indiscriminately to a street or [illegible] of the canal [illegible] and also to a street of private houses and other [illegible]. The limiting height of 70 feet specified in H. 6000 is so low as would result in [illegible] or [illegible] [illegible] which [illegible] as [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

The Commission of Fine Arts believe that it would be distinctly better for the appearance of the city and its orderly development, and at the same time much more equitable to owners of real estate, if Congress were to recognize the sharp distinction between those two classes of residential property and provide for two classes of residential districts. In one class the height limitations might be substantially as favorable for elevator apartment houses as they are on "residence streets" under the present law; possibly more so. In the other class of districts the height limitation would be less than seventy feet; in fact would be set at whatever height is found to be the most advantageous for property where elevators are not to be expected and where tall neighbors are objectionable. The limiting height in the second class of residential districts might be sixty feet, but it is very unsafe to hazard a positive opinion upon such a point without obtaining a large body of evidence as to actual conditions of real estate in Washington by hearings or otherwise.

Lack of detailed information also makes it very unsafe to suggest arbitrarily just which streets should be included in one district and which in another. It is clear that the present method of determining which properties are subject only to the high limitations of "business streets" and which are subject to the lower limitation of "residence streets", is very unsatisfactory and unfair. The Commission of Fine Arts believe that the only reasonably satisfactory method for dealing with this entire subject would be the designation by Congress of a suitable Commission or committee to conduct hearings and otherwise thoroughly inform itself and upon the evidence obtained to define the building height limitations for as many classes of districts as may seem desirable and determine the boundaries of the several districts, all subject to confirmation of the Commission's findings by Congress and subject to some orderly and deliberate method of revising the boundaries from time to time

upon the submission of evidence justifying changes.

I append for a more detailed discussion of certain aspects of the subject a copy of a report submitted by the Commission of Fine Arts to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on May 9, 1916.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

ABC*FS

Hon. Willard Saulsbury
Chairman, Subcommittee on Streets and Avenues,
Committee on the District of Columbia,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,
May 4, 1910.

345

Mr. Secretary:

Your Jury of Award in the Francis Scott Key Memorial Competition have carefully considered the site designated for that memorial at Fort McHenry, Baltimore, and have carefully studied the thirty-four models received in the competition. The Jury recommend that the memorial should be placed on the line of Fort avenue east by south, approximately 400 feet from the present entrance, making it a focal point of interest when viewed from Fort Avenue and the two proposed driveways, as well as an attractive point when viewed from the harbor.

The Jury feel that the memorial should be high enough to mark distinctly the intersection of these three driveways, but not so high as in any way to dominate Fort McHenry. So the view of the base may not be cut off from the harbor, the Jury recommend raising the grade at the intersection of these three roadways to the thirty feet grade line. The Jury also advise that nothing should be placed in the proposed new plaza or circle at the entrance to the Fort which would interfere with the view of the memorial from Fort Avenue, and that no structure be placed on the harbor shore that will mar the view from that direction.

Guided by these conclusions the Jury have selected model numbered 28 as best representing the ideals in sculpture, and recommend that this model be awarded first place provided the architectural features are modified so as to be more suitable for the site. The sculpture on this model is so superior that, in the judgment of the Jury, it outweighs the want of a fitting architectural setting, which setting in the opinion of the Jury can easily be modified to form a focal point at the intersection of the three roadways. If the competitor submitting this design does not agree to make these modifications in the architectural setting, the Jury would recommend that the award be given to the model awarded second prize under the same conditions as to the modification of the architectural setting and that in that event model numbered 28 shall be given second prize.

The Jury further recommend the award of the other prescribed prizes as follows:

Second prize,.....model numbered 2.

Third prize,.....model numbered 12.

Fourth prize,.....model numbered 26.

The Jury would also recommend the award of the following Honorable Mention:

First Honorable Mention,.....model numbered 25.

Second Honorable Mention,.....model numbered 32.

Third Honorable Mention,.....model numbered 1.

The Jury wish to state that, while either the composition, architecture, or sculpture was often of great merit, as a whole no one of the models could have been approved without a decided modification in either the architecture or the sculpture,

Washington, D. C.,
May 4, 1916.

Secretary:

Your Jury of Award in the Francis Scott Key Memorial Competition have carefully considered the site designated for that memorial at Fort McHenry, Baltimore, and have carefully studied the thirty-four models received in the competition.

The Jury recommend that the memorial should be placed on the line of Fort avenue at its south, approximately 600 feet from the present entrance, making it a focal point of interest when viewed from Fort Avenue and the two proposed driveways, as well as an attractive point when viewed from the harbor.

The Jury feel that the memorial should be high enough to mark distinctly the intersection of these three driveways, but not so highas in any way to dominate Fort McHenry. So the view of the land may not be cut off from the harbor.

The Jury recommend making the grade at the intersection of these three roadways two thirty feet grade line. The Jury also advise that nothing should be placed the proposed new piers or docks at the entrance to the Fort which would interfere with the view of the memorial from Fort Avenue, and that no structure be placed on harbor shore that will mar the view from that direction.

Guided by these conclusions the Jury have selected model numbered 28 as best representing the ideals in sculpture, and recommend that this model be awarded first prize provided the architectural features are modified so as to be more suitable to the site. The sculpture on this model is so superior that, in the judgment of Jury, it outweighs the want of a fitting architectural setting, which setting in the opinion of the Jury can easily be modified to form a focal point at the intersection the three roadways. If the competitor submitting this design does not agree to these modifications in the architectural setting, the Jury would recommend that award be given to the model awarded second prize under the same conditions as to modification of the architectural setting and that in that event model numbered shall be given second prize.

The Jury further recommend the award of the other premiated prizes as follows:

Second Prize,.....model numbered 4.

Third Prize,.....model numbered 12.

Fourth Prize,.....model numbered 24.

The Jury would also recommend the award of the following Honorable Mention:

First Honorable Mention,.....model numbered 25.

Second Honorable Mention,.....model numbered 22.

Third Honorable Mention,.....model numbered 1.

The Jury wish to state that, while either the composition, sculpture, or sculpture was often of great merit, as a whole no one of the models could have been approved without a decided modification in either the architecture or the sculpture,

or of the composition. The Jury wish to recommend the installation, which was impressive as a whole and allowed them ample room to study the models, which were well lighted and displayed.

GLENN BROWN

HERMAN MACNEIL

A. A. WEINMAN

JAMES A. PRESTON

CHAS. A. LINDEICUM

Jury of Award,
Francis Scott Key Memorial Competition.

tic composition. The Jury wish to recommend the institution, which was
ive as a whole and allowed their ample room to study the models, which were
ighted and displayed.

GLENN BROWN

HERMAN MACNEIL

F. A. WILMARTH

JAMES A. WESTON

CHAS. A. DIETRICH

Jury of Award,
Francis Boott Ky Memorial Competition.